



Strasbourg, 12 April 2007

MC-S-MD(2007)002

[PDF](#)

**GROUP OF SPECIALISTS ON MEDIA DIVERSITY  
(MC-S-MD)**

---

**5th meeting  
4 and 5 April 2007  
Human Rights Building, Strasbourg  
Room 20 RC Jardin**

---

**REPORT**

---

**Items 1 and 2 of the agenda:      Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**

1. The Secretariat opened the meeting, welcomed participants and gave some general indications about the MC-S-MD's work in the light of its updated terms of reference and about the purpose of the meeting in particular.

2. The agenda was adopted as it stood. The list of participants is set out in Appendix I. The agenda, as adopted, is set out in Appendix II, where the working documents are also listed.

**Item 3 of the agenda:      Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2007**

3. The Secretariat pointed out that the terms of office of the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson had expired at the end of 2006 and that the group therefore had to elect its Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2007.

4. Ms Zrinjka PERUŠKO (Croatia) was elected Chairperson and Mr Jacques FAVRE (Switzerland) Vice-Chairperson, for terms of one year. Both were elected unanimously.

**Item 5 of the agenda:      Work of the MC-S-MD in 2007 – adoption of a work plan based on the updated terms of reference**

5. The MC-S-MD discussed its updated terms of reference. Some members expressed disappointment that the proposed establishment of a network of experts on media diversity had not been approved by the CDMC. Others believed that, in its future work, the group would have to make use of national correspondents and hence rely on an informal network as a source of information on media diversity in the member states.

6. The Secretariat proposed a draft work plan for 2007-2008 designed to meet the group's updated terms of reference. The Chairperson proposed that the group consider, possibly amend and adopt the work plan after discussing items 6 to 10 of the agenda (see work plan as adopted by the group in Appendix III). In practical terms, to enable the MC-S-MD to make the best possible use of the four meetings scheduled over the next two years, it was proposed that a number of experts meet in select groups between meetings to work on specific issues.

7. In this connection, the Secretariat pointed out that, from May 2007, an online work system was to be put in place, which should facilitate work on any draft texts. It was agreed, however, that if funding permitted, it would be useful for an ad hoc working group to meet and prepare draft documents for submission to the CDMC at its November meeting.

**Item 6 of the agenda:      Methodology for the monitoring of media concentration**

8. The European Commission representative said that his organisation was in the process of launching a project on media pluralism. This included the preparation for the end of 2008 of a study on the subject, which should be followed by a communication on media pluralism indicators in the individual member states. The aim of the project was to draw up a list of indicators with which it would be possible (a) to gain a clearer picture of the various methods used by the member states to protect media pluralism, (b) to assess the risks affecting media

pluralism and (c) to devise appropriate solutions. The objective of the exercise was not to monitor media concentration as such, the approach adopted being broader.

9. In this connection, the Chairperson pointed out that the purpose of the MC-S-MD's work was not to monitor concentration either, but to consider media diversity, of which concentration was only one aspect to be taken into account. The group should look at concentration not from the point of view of economics/competition but from that of pluralism/diversity of content. The MC-S-MD needed to consider the relationship between economics/competition on the one hand and pluralism/diversity on the other.

10. One expert said that the group should, among other things, consider the effects of concentration on content, in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Concentration was not negative by definition if the internal diversity of the media was guaranteed. The MC-S-MD should look closely at the factors which prevented pluralism.

11. The EBU representative said that the MC-S-MD should co-operate in this area with the European Commission and the European Audiovisual Observatory to avoid the repetition of work already done and any overlapping. It would also be necessary clearly to define the types of media to be considered. In this connection, one expert considered that, in addition to government regulation, it would be useful to consider self-regulation by the media themselves.

12. With regard to the practical results of the group's work on this theme, one expert referred to the existence of several documents on media concentration, in particular the study by David Ward and the report on media concentration (2004), which could serve as information sources. He proposed that a working group prepare a draft document summarising a number of methods of monitoring media concentration in various member states.

13. A number of volunteers came forward for the working group: Croatia, Switzerland and Russia. It was agreed that the working group would prepare a draft report for the next meeting in September. It was too early to consider the question of appointing a consultant on the subject and the matter would be considered again once the draft report was prepared.

14. At the same time, the above working group proposed that a brief questionnaire be sent to member states on methods for monitoring media concentration (see questionnaire drawn up by the working group in Appendix IV). The MC-S-MD approved the approach and agreed that the replies to the questionnaire could add to the draft report.

**Item 7 of the agenda:**

**Implementation of Recommendation No R (2003) 9 on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting**

15. The group took note of the compendium of replies to the questionnaire on the implementation of Committee of Ministers Recommendation No R (2003) 9 on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting, and of the additional compendium of replies. A number of experts said that the information contained in the additional compendium of replies in particular was interesting and might be useful for the preparation of a compendium of good practices in this area.

16. At the same time, the group noted that the information gathered to date was insufficient for preparing a compendium of good practices, as it was largely statistical. Several experts agreed that it would be useful to obtain more information about positive practices established in the countries that were most advanced in terms of digital broadcasting. If compiled in a compendium and published on the Internet, such practices could serve as examples and sources of encouragement for other countries.

17. The European Commission representative suggested that information gathering by email could be supplemented by telephone calls where possible, which could speed up the process and ensure fuller replies. The EBU representative agreed with the approach, but said that the task would be very time consuming and it would therefore be necessary to appoint a consultant. The Group agreed to take a decision on the necessity to invite a consultant on the topic at its next meeting in September.

18. With regard to the states to be contacted, the European Commission representative suggested approaching countries where digital broadcasting penetration rates were at least 50%. The group agreed. With regard to the content of the questions, it was agreed that they should be modelled on the supplementary questionnaire (cf. MC-S-MD(2007)001) and request additional information on good practices in terms of (i) preparation of the public for the new digital environment and (ii) adaptation of the public service remit to the digital environment (see questionnaire proposed by the group in Appendix V).

19. It was agreed that the final format of the compendium of good practices would be determined in September, depending on the information gathered.

20. The EBU representative and the Austrian delegate volunteered to form a working group on the subject with the task of drawing up a draft report as a basis for the compendium of good practices.

**Item 8 of the agenda:**

**The role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities, with special attention to the role that can be played by community, local, minority and social media**

21. In general terms, the Chairperson noted that the issue of social cohesion, which came within point (iii) of the MC-S-MD's updated terms of reference considered under items 6 to 10 of the agenda, was a new subject for the group. One expert believed that it was an important issue against the background of the Council of Europe's work on the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue and that the MC-S-MD should make a contribution here.

22. Again in general terms, one expert said that, for the group's future work, the exact meaning assigned in the Kyiv Action Plan to concepts such as "social cohesion" and "social media" should be defined very clearly so as to avoid any confusion.

23. Several experts agreed that the three indents of point (iii) of the MC-S-MD's updated terms of reference should be explored separately because of the differences between them.

24. With regard to the first indent, one expert said that the issue of community media was very complex and that the MC-S-MD should have recourse in its work here to specialist organisations such as the Forum for Community Media and the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC). Another expert noted that the meaning of the

concept “minority/community media” differed from one country to the next and was not necessarily linked with the “local media” category.

25. He also drew attention to the (at least apparent) contradiction between the goal to be achieved, i.e. “social cohesion,” and the means to be employed, i.e. “minority/community media.” In his view, the latter were supposed to strengthen minorities/communities and were therefore capable of weakening social cohesion/integration. The EBU representative agreed and confirmed that some media could exacerbate ghetto mentalities and community isolationism.

26. The MC-S-MD agreed that a consultant would be needed to move this subject forward. An ad hoc working group (Bulgaria and Poland) drew up draft terms of reference for the consultant (see draft terms of reference drawn up by the working group in Appendix VI). The MC-S-MD decided that at its next meeting in September, an exchange of views with the consultant will be organised in order to advise him/her on the further work.

**Item 9 of the agenda:**

**The role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities; addressing the ways in which the public in all its diversity can be involved in consultative programming structures**

27. With regard to the second indent concerning ways of involving the public in consultative programming structures, one expert believed that, in order to move forward here, additional information would have to be obtained for the group’s next meeting in September. Possible sources of information could be the EBU, which could provide details concerning public service broadcasters, and the European Newspaper Publishers Association (ENPA), concerning the print media. Possible additional sources of information were the European Platform of Regulatory Authorities (EPRA) and ARTICLE 19.

28. The EBU representative said that his organisation could provide some information concerning public service broadcasters. At the same time, the MC-S-MD should extend the research to private broadcasters as well. It was also necessary to make a clear distinction between consultative structures (which were supposed to be pluralist) and methods of dialogue with television viewers.

29. The representative of the Online/More Colour in the Media foundation said that some good practices did exist in the electronic media for involving the public more closely and ensuring the pluralism of consultative structures. In the Netherlands, for instance, the regulatory authorities could withdraw operators’ licences if their consultative structures were not pluralist.

30. The group agreed that the Secretariat would contact the above organisations to gather information on the subject.

**Item 10 of the agenda:****The role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities; the importance of independent productions for media pluralism and social cohesion**

31. With regard to the third indent concerning independent productions, the Chairperson said that, in general terms, the link between independent productions and social cohesion was not obvious. Other experts agreed that the subject had been linked to “social cohesion” in a relatively artificial manner.

32. The EBU representative said that the group should be cautious in its approach to the subject of independent productions, as it had already been covered in the European Television without Frontiers Directive. With a view to harmonisation between the directive and the Convention on Transfrontier Television, the Council of Europe could possibly discuss the issue within the Standing Committee on Transfrontier Television.

33. An ad hoc working group on the subject (Romania, Belgium and European Commission) undertook to prepare a draft report for the MC-S-MD’s meeting in September, if possible even before July.

**Items 3 and 4 of the agenda:****Decisions of the CDMC and other information of interest to the work of the MC-S-MD**

34. The Secretariat reported on the decisions taken by the CDMC at its 4th meeting (28 November - 1 December 2006) which were of interest to the work of the group, in particular the approval of the draft declaration on protecting the role of the media in democracy in the context of media concentration and of the draft recommendation on media pluralism and diversity of media content. The two instruments had been adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 31 January 2007. On the same date, the Committee of Ministers had also adopted the Recommendation on the remit of public service media in the information society.

**Item 11 of the agenda:****Other business**

35. None.

**Item 12 of the agenda:****Dates of next meeting**

36. The next meeting of the MC-S-MD would take place in Strasbourg on 10 and 11 September 2007.

\* \* \*

## Appendix I

### List of participants

#### I. MEMBER STATES/ETATS MEMBRES

##### **Austria/Autriche**

Ms Waltraud BAUER, Federal Chancellery/Legal Service, Department of Media Affairs and Information Society, WIEN

##### **Belgium/Belgique**

Mme Muriel COLOT, Attachée, Service général de l'audiovisuel et des multimédias, Communauté française, BRUXELLES

##### **Bulgaria/Bulgarie**

Mme Nina VENOVA, Bulgarian News Agency, Rédacteur LIK, SOFIA

M. Svetlozar Kirilov IVANOV, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication, Sofia University, SOFIA

##### **Croatia/Croatie**

Ms Zrinjka PERUŠKO, Associate Professor, Department of Journalism, Faculty of Political Science, ZAGREB

##### **Greece/Grèce**

Mme Maria GIANNAKAKI, Attachée de Presse, Représentation Permanente de la Grèce auprès du Conseil de l'Europe, Bureau de Presse et de Communication, STRASBOURG

##### **Latvia/Lettonie**

Mr Ilmārs ŠLĀPINS, Advisor on Culture and Humanities to the Prime Minister, State Chancellery, RĪGA

##### **Lithuania/Lituanie**

Ms Audrone NUGARAITE, Associate Professor, Institute of Journalism, Vilnius University, VILNIUS

##### **Norway/Norvège**

<Apologised/Excusé>

Mr Lars BRUSTAD, Assistant Director General, Department of Media and Copyright, Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs, OSLO

##### **Poland/Pologne**

Mr Pawel STEPKA, Senior Inspector, National Broadcasting Council, WARSAW

##### **Portugal**

M. Agostinho PISSARREIRA, Département des Relations Internationales, Instituto da Comunicação Social, LISBOA

**Romania/Roumanie**

Ms Elly-Ana TARNACOP-MOGA, Conseillère pour les affaires européennes, Ministère de la Culture et des Cultes, BUCAREST

**Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie**

Mrs Elena VARTANOVA, Deputy Dean For Research, Professor, Faculty Of Journalism, Moscow State University, MOSCOW

**Slovak Republic/République slovaque**

M. Igor CHOVAN, Head of licencing Department, Council for broadcasting and retransmission, Bratislava

**Spain/Espagne**

Mr Emilio VICIANA DURO, Chef du service de la sous-direction générale des moyens audiovisuels, Ministère de l'industrie, du tourisme et du commerce, Madrid

**Switzerland/Suisse**

M. Jacques FAVRE, Chargé de cours à l'Université de Fribourg, VALLORBE

**“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”/ « L'ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine »**

Mr Janko NIKOLOVSKI, President of the Commission, Commission for protecting the right on free access to information of public character, SKOPJE

**Turkey/Turquie**

Mr Nihat CAYLAK, International Relations Department, Radio and Television Supreme Council, Bilkent, ANKARA

Ms Ozlem Pinar KURBAN, Monitoring Department, Radio and Television Supreme Council, Bilkent, ANKARA

**United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni**

<Apologised/Excusé>

Mr Mark FERRERO, Department of Culture, Media and Sport, LONDON

**I. OTHER PARTICIPANTS/AUTRES PARTICIPANTS****Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe/Assemblée Parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe****Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe/Congrès des Pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe**

Mr Dario GHISLETTA, Congrès des Pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe, membre de la délégation suisse

**European Audiovisual Observatory/Observatoire européen de l'Audiovisuel**



**European Commission/Commission européenne**

Mr Adam WATSON BROWN, Principal Administrator, Unit A1: Audiovisual & Media Policies; Digital Rights, Task Force for Co-ordination of Media Affairs, DG Information Society Media, European Commission, BRUSSELS

**II. OSERVERS WITH THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE/OBSERVATEURS AUPRES DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE****Canada**

<Apologised/Excusée>

Mme Andrée N. LACASSE, Conseillère en politiques, Relation internationale & rayonnement, Patrimoine canadien

**Holy See/Saint-Siège**

<Apologised/Excusé>

M. Louis Ter STEEG, Utrecht

**III. OSERVERS WITH THE MC-S-MD/OBSERVATEURS AU SEIN DU MC-S-MD****UNESCO****Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)/  
Organisation pour la Sécurité et la Coopération en Europe (OSCE)**

Mr Roland BLESS, Director, OSCE Office of the Representative on Freedom of the Media, VIENNA

**European Broadcasting Union/Union Européenne de Radio-Télévision**

Mr Michael WAGNER, Directeur adjoint, Département des Affaires juridiques, Union Européenne de Radio-Télévision, GRAND-SACONNEX GE

Mr Jacques BRIQUEMONT, Responsable des affaires publiques, Union Européenne de Radio-Télévision, BRUXELLES

**Association of Commercial Television in Europe/Association des Télévisions commerciales européennes**

Ms Monika MAGYAR, Legal Advisor, Association of Commercial Television in Europe, BRUXELLES

**European Federation of Journalists/Fédération européenne des Journalistes**

M. Philippe LERUTH, Vice-président FEJ, Bruxelles

**European Newspaper Publishers' Association/Association européenne des Editeurs de Journaux**

Ms Hannah McCAUSLAND, European Affairs Advisor, European Newspaper Publishers' Association, BRUSSELS

**Foundation 'Online/More Colour in the Media**

Mr Ed Klute, President, OLMCM, BE Utrecht

**European Internet Services Providers Association (EuroISPA)**

M. Richard NASH, Secretary General, EuroISPA, BRUSSELS

**IV. SECRETARIAT**

Mr Jan MALINOWSKI, Head of the Media Division, Directorate General of Human Rights - DG II/  
Chef de la Division Media, Direction Générale des Droits de l'Homme - DG II

Mr Ivan NIKOLTCHEV, Administrator, Media Division, Directorate General of Human  
Rights/Administrateur, Division Médias, Direction Générale des Droits de l'Homme

Mr Eugen CIBOTARU, Administrator, Media Division, Directorate General of Human  
Rights/Administrateur, Division Médias, Direction Générale des Droits de l'Homme

**V. INTERPRETERS/INTERPRETES**

Olivier OBRECHT

Remy JAIN

Nadine KIEFFER

\* \* \*

## Appendix II

### Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda
2. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2007
3. Decisions of the Steering Committee on the Media and New Communication Services (CDMC) of interest to the work of the MC-S-MD
4. Other information of interest to the work of the MC-S-MD
5. Work of the MC-S-MD in 2007 – *adoption of a work plan based on the updated terms of reference*
6. Methodology for the monitoring of media concentration – *elaboration of a proposal*
7. Implementation of Recommendation Rec (2003)9 on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting – *finalisation of the monitoring and compilation of a compendium of good practices in member states in this field*
8. The role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities, with special attention to the role that can be played by community, local, minority and social media – *working method in view of the preparation of a standard-setting instrument on possible measures which could be taken in support of these media or their contribution*
9. The role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities; addressing the ways in which the public in all its diversity can be involved in consultative programming structures – *working method in view of the preparation of a document or standard-setting instrument*
10. The role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities; the importance of independent productions for media pluralism and social cohesion – *working method in view of the preparation of a report or a standard-setting instrument on possible support measures for independent productions*
11. Other business
12. Dates of next meeting

## Appendix III

## Work plan of the Group of specialists on media diversity (MC-S-MD) for 2007-2008

Kyiv Action Plan/Mission/ToR	Actions	Results	Time frame
<p>(1) Elaborate a detailed proposal for a methodology for the monitoring of media concentration and, if possible, for measuring the impact of media concentration on media pluralism and content diversity (<i>cf. item 9 of the Kyiv Action Plan</i>).</p>	<p>The Group will gather information on the methodology for the monitoring of media concentration in different member states, and analyse the possibility for elaborating a draft proposal on the matter.</p>	<p>Draft proposal on the methodology for the monitoring of media concentration</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2007</b></p> <p>(i) At the meeting of the Group in <u>April 2007</u>, agree on an approach to be taken; create a working group for preparation of a draft report on the matter; draft a questionnaire to be sent after the meeting to the member states.</p> <p>(ii) At the meeting of the Group in <u>September 2007</u>, examine the outline for a draft report and the responses to the questionnaire; take a decision on the necessity to invite a consultant on the topic and if so, draft terms of reference for the latter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2008</b></p> <p>(iii) At the <u>1<sup>st</sup> meeting</u> of the Group in <u>2008</u>, on the basis of the draft report and updated responses to the questionnaire, prepare a preliminary draft proposal on the methodology for the monitoring of media concentration in different member states.</p> <p>(iv) At the <u>2<sup>nd</sup> meeting</u> of the Group in <u>2008</u>, finalise the draft proposal on the matter.</p>
<p>(2) Complete the monitoring of the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2003)9 of the Committee of Ministers on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting, and compile a compendium of good practices in member states in this field (<i>cf. item 14 of the Kyiv Action Plan</i>).</p>	<p>The Group will prepare a compendium of best practices on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting.</p>	<p>Draft compendium of best practices on the matter</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2007</b></p> <p>(i) At the meeting of the Group in <u>April 2007</u>, examine the additional responses to the questionnaire with a view to identifying the next steps to be taken; after the meeting, send an additional questionnaire to a number of targeted member states to collect additional information; create a working group for preparation of a draft report on the matter.</p> <p>(ii) At the meeting in <u>September 2007</u>, examine additional information and a draft report on the matter by the working group. Take a decision on the necessity to invite a consultant on the topic and if so, draft terms of reference for the latter.</p>

Kyiv Action Plan/Mission/ToR	Actions	Results	Time frame
			<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2008</b></p> <p>(iii) At the <u>1<sup>st</sup> meeting</u> of the Group in <u>2008</u>, review the collected information and agree on the essential elements of the draft compendium of best practices.</p> <p>(iv) At the <u>2<sup>nd</sup> meeting</u> of the Group in <u>2008</u>, finalise the draft compendium of best practices.</p>
<p><b>(3)</b> Examine the role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities (<i>cf. item 13 of the Kyiv Action Plan</i>) and in particular:</p> <p><b>(a)</b> pay particular attention to the part that can be played in this context by community, local, minority and social media, and prepare a draft standard-setting instrument on possible measures which could be taken in support of these types of media;</p> <p><b>(b)</b> prepare a document or standard-setting instrument addressing the ways in which the public in all its diversity can be involved in consultative programming structures;</p> <p><b>(c)</b> examine the importance of independent productions for media pluralism and social cohesion and prepare a report on the subject or a standard-setting instrument on possible support measures for independent productions (<i>cf. also item 12 of the Kyiv Action Plan</i>).</p>	<p>The Group will prepare:</p> <p><b>(a)</b> a draft document or standard-setting instrument on possible measures which could be taken in support of community, local, minority and social media;</p> <p><b>(b)</b> a draft document or standard-setting instrument addressing the ways in which the public in all its diversity can be involved in consultative programming structures;</p> <p><b>(c)</b> a draft document or standard-setting instrument on possible support measures for independent productions,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>or, alternatively:</i></p> <p>a draft document or standard-setting instrument on the role of the media in promoting social cohesion and the integration of different communities, containing sub-chapters on the 3 above-mentioned themes.</p>	<p>3 draft documents or standard-setting instruments (see Actions) <i>or, alternatively,</i> a draft document or standard-setting instrument containing sub-chapters on the 3 themes</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2007</b></p> <p>(i) <b>(3-a)</b> At the meeting of the Group in <u>April 2007</u>, identify essential elements for draft terms of reference for a consultant; create a working group which will prepare the draft ToR; after the meeting, engage a consultant on the basis of prepared ToR.  <b>(3-b)</b> Identify essential elements for future work. After the meeting, the Secretariat will contact a number of organisations to gather information on the subject.  <b>(3-c)</b> Create a working group for preparation of a draft report on the matter.</p> <p>(ii) <b>(3-a)</b> At the meeting of the Group in <u>September 2007</u>, organise an exchange of views with the consultant and advise him/her on the further work.  <b>(3-b)</b> Examine the collected responses on the matter.  <b>(3-c)</b> Examine the draft report prepared by the working group and decide on future action.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2008</b></p> <p>(iii) <b>(3-a)</b> At the <u>1<sup>st</sup> meeting</u> of the Group in <u>2008</u>, on the basis of the consultant's report, elaborate a preliminary draft document or standard-setting instrument on the matter.  <b>3-b)</b> Prepare a draft document addressing the issue.  <b>(3-c)</b> Continue work as decided at September 2007 meeting.</p> <p>(iv) <b>(3-a)</b> At the <u>2<sup>nd</sup> meeting</u> of the Group in <u>2008</u>, finalise a revised version of the draft text.  <b>(3-b)</b> Finalise the draft document addressing the issue.  <b>(3-c)</b> Continue work as decided at September 2007 meeting.</p>

## **Appendix IV**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE ON METHODOLOGY FOR THE MONITORING OF MEDIA CONCENTRATION, PLURALISM AND DIVERSITY**

#### **1. Monitoring of media concentration**

- a. What law regulates media concentration in your country? When was it adopted?
- b. Is there a system to monitor media concentration in your country?  
If yes:
  - i. Please provide the name of the responsible body.
  - ii. What sectors – press, broadcasting or new media – are included?
  - iii. How often are monitoring reports on media concentration published?
  - iv. When was the last monitoring report published?
  - v. Please describe the method of assessment and the criteria for assessing the level of media concentration.

#### **2. Monitoring of media pluralism and diversity**

- a. How are media pluralism and diversity defined in your regulation?
- b. Is there a system to monitor media pluralism and diversity in your country?  
If yes:
  - a. What body is in charge?
  - b. How do you measure or evaluate the degree of media pluralism and diversity?
  - c. What aspects of pluralism and diversity you monitor:
    - structure (diversity of media companies and outlets, composition of national and local media markets, audiences and regulatory structures, etc.)?
    - content (genres, formats, opinions including political, cultural, religious, etc.)?
    - sources (news agencies, independent production, etc.)?
  - d. Please describe any support measures and monitoring mechanisms that you have put into place in order to encourage media pluralism and diversity.

#### **3. Recent studies in your country**

- a. Please list any recent studies in your country on:
  - i. media concentration in general;
  - ii. impact of concentration on media pluralism of content;
  - iii. audience satisfaction vis-à-vis media pluralism of content.
- b. Are there any available studies (in English or French) that you can send to us?
- c. Please list any relevant institutions active in the field of media concentration, pluralism and diversity.

#### **4. Any additional comments?**

## Appendix V

### **Implementation of Recommendation No. R (2003) 9 on measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting: Additional questions addressed to a number of selected member states**

#### **1. Preparation of the public for the new digital environment**

Please give examples of what you consider as particularly successful steps taken in your country in order to prepare the public for the new digital environment.

(For instance, has a scheme for informing and training the public on the use of digital equipment been set up?)

#### **2. Adaptation of public service broadcasters' remit to the new digital environment**

Please give examples of what you consider as particularly successful steps taken in your country in order to adapt the remit of public service broadcasters to the new digital environment?

(For instance, please describe which new services, such as new specialised channels, on-line services, electronic programme guides, etc., contributing to the democratic and social objectives, have been developed by the public service broadcasters)

#### **3. Which other related measures, which do not fall directly under the above, have been particularly successful in your view?**

(This could concern, for instance, access to networks and associated facilities, etc.)

\* \* \*

## Appendix VI

### **Draft terms of reference for a consultant on the point iii (a) (“community, local, minority and social media”) of the terms of reference of the MC-S-MD**

1. To identify the most important issues concerning the relationship between media and social cohesion.
2. To summarise existing definitions (including legal ones) of "third sector media" understood as media which are neither public nor commercial. To take into account that "third sector media" are referred loosely also as community, local, minority, non-profit and social media. The classification of "third sector media" should include *inter alia* the following aspects: ownership, structure, funding, content/programming, audience involvement, different platforms, including new media.
3. To provide an outline of the discussion on the positive and negative aspects of the role of "third sector media" in the society. Efforts should be aimed at summing up the controversies raised by "third sector media", especially debates if "third sector media" contribute to social cohesion and integration or they threaten it. The summary should be illustrated with a number of case studies focused on different countries.  
*(N.B. These could include non-member states e.g. USA, Canada).*
4. To describe existing measures to support third sector media (including financial and technical measures) either by governmental or non-governmental bodies/organisations.